

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1-19 are rejected. Claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended herein. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. No new matter has been added herein as the result of the amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONSRejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**Claims 1-19**

The Office Action Mailed on February 8, 2007 (hereinafter, “instant Office Action”) states that Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tung Ng et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 6,279,008) (hereinafter, “Tung”). The rejections and comments set forth in the instant Office Action have been carefully considered by the Applicant. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-19 are not anticipated by Tung in view of at least the instant response.

Applicant respectfully notes that amended Claim 1 recites (Claims 11 and 16 include similarly amended features):

An article of manufacture comprising a program storage medium having computer readable code embodied therein, said computer readable code being configured to implement a graphical user interface (GUI) template, said GUI template being configured to create one of a plurality of graphical user interfaces (GUIs), comprising:
computer readable code for rendering a plurality of GUI components;
computer readable code for implementing a plurality of functions, each of said plurality of functions being associated with one of said plurality of GUI components, one of said plurality of functions being invoked when a respective one of said plurality of GUI components is activated by a user via said one of said plurality of GUIs, wherein said plurality of functions are created, tested, and integrated with said plurality of GUI components in advance of said one of said plurality of functions being invoked; and
computer readable code for implementing a calling mechanism, said calling mechanism permitting a user to specify a subset of said plurality of GUI components to be rendered in said one of said plurality of GUIs.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully notes, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”. MPEP §2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 103 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). “The elements must be arranged as required by the claim...” *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The instant Office Action states that,

Tung shows an article of manufacture comprising a program storage medium having computer readable code embodied therein, said computer readable code being configured to implement a graphical user interface (GUI) template, said GUI template being configured to create one of a plurality of graphical user interfaces (GUIs), comprising:

computer readable code for rendering a plurality of GUI components (GUI to display object oriented applications and tables in database...;

computer readable code for implementing a plurality of functions..., each of said plurality of functions being associated with one of said plurality of GUI components...,one of said plurality of functions being invoked when a respective one of said plurality of GUI components is activated by a user via said one of said plurality of GUIs...; and

computer readable code for implementing a calling mechanism, said calling mechanism permitting a user to specify a subset ... of said plurality of GUI components to be rendered in said one of said plurality of GUIs...]

(Instant Office Action, page 2, section 2.)

Applicant respectfully submits that Tung does not anticipate “computer readable code for implementing a plurality of functions, each of said plurality of functions being associated with one of said plurality of GUI components, one of said plurality of functions being invoked when a respective one of said plurality of GUI components is activated by a user via said one of said plurality of GUIs, wherein said plurality of functions are created, tested, and integrated with said plurality of GUI components in advance of said one of said plurality of functions being invoked” (emphasis added) as is recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. Applicant understands Tung to disclose an “integrated graphical user interface method and apparatus for mapping between objects and databases” (Tung, Title) in which “[a] GUI designed consistent with the present invention [Tung] supports object-database mapping and rapid testing of numerous object-oriented and database scenarios” (Tung, column 4, lines 13-16). Additionally, Tung provides for:

[s]tored procedures [that] allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database. Typically, stored procedures are compiled and stored in the database when the database is created. A user may indirectly invoke these stored procedures in an object-oriented application by adding, deleting, and operating on objects.

(Emphasis added; Tung, column 4, lines 44-49.)

Specifically, Tung fails to disclose, “wherein said plurality of functions are created, tested, and integrated with said plurality of GUI components in advance of said implementing”, as is recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. Whereas Tung discloses a system in which numerous objects may be rapidly tested after the objects have been added to, deleted from, and operated upon, Applicant’s Claim 1 teaches a plurality of functions that are created, tested, and integrated with GUI components in advance of creating a GUI. (Applicant’s Claim 1; Applicant’s specification, paragraph [0020].)

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Tung does not anticipate “wherein said plurality of functions are created, tested, and integrated with said plurality of GUI components in advance of said implementing” (emphasis added) as is recited in Applicant’s Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Tung does not anticipate the features as are set forth in independent Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and is condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Tung does not anticipate Claims 11 and 16 for reasons stated herein in regards to Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-10 depending on Claim 1, Claims 12-15 depending on Claim 11, and Claims 17-19 depending on Claim 16, overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being dependent on an allowable base Claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks and amendments, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims 1-19.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 07/28/2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Wagner Blecher LLP

123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500